

677
13

ADDRESS
OF
SENATOR BIGLER,
TO
THE DEMOCRACY OF PHILADELPHIA,
IN
INDEPENDENCE SQUARE, JULY 4, 1856.

Mr. BIGLER was welcomed to the stand by demonstrations of zealous applause, and commenced his address by saying: It was the remark of an eminent American scholar, that it is one of the God-like attributes of man's mind that enables him to mingle the results of the past, the realities of the present, and the imaginations of the future, covering centuries of the world's career, and contemplate the whole scene together; and again, that measuring time by the ideas conceived and the events witnessed, the men of modern times enjoy a longevity equal to that of the patriarchs of old. And it has occurred to my mind, at this moment, fellow-citizens, that the scenes about us to-day, the recollections of the past suggested by the occasion, and the ideas of the future which these seem to present, not less than the historic voice of the oration to which we have just listened, furnish a striking illustration of the truth and beauty of the sayings I have quoted. The hallowed spot on which we stand reminds us of the nation's birth-day, of the dawn of liberty, and of the mighty consequences that have followed. The presence of Independence Hall suggests to the mind the scenes of '76, the period when our fathers, native and foreign-born, Protestant and Catholic, seeking redress for the oppressed colonies, gathered within its now venerable walls to counsel together for the liberty and rights of all, no matter where born or of what religious belief. Then it was that John Hancock and Samuel Adams, of Massachusetts; Edward Rutledge and Thomas Heyward, of South Carolina; Benjamin Franklin, Charles Carroll, Thomas Jefferson, Roger Sherman, and their glorious compeers, matured and enunciated those great truths which are still found at the basis of our republican system, and which renounced all government and taxation, in the absence of representation, and proclaimed independence and self-government for the colonies. It was that act and deed that ushered America into the family of nations, at the same time that it astonished the world by a new revelation of liberty, and of man's natural and inherent rights, fixing new relations between the governing and governed, and giving effective vitality to the spirit of civil and religious freedom. From that time to the present, those just and safe axioms have stood out in bold relief, like beacon-lights for the guidance of those intrusted with the helm of state. We are also reminded of a scene, at a later date, when, within the sound of

my voice, George Washington, James Madison, Charles Pinckney, Thomas Mifflin, Benjamin Franklin, and their associates, devised a scheme for the union of the States. They agreed that the States should compose one family, on terms of perfect equality; each remaining free to have its own domestic institutions, and that new States might come in thereafter on terms of perfect equality; that the government of the States, so united, should exercise only such powers as were expressly conferred, and that all other powers should be reserved to the people and to the States.

Considered in all their bearings upon the condition of mankind, these events have scarce been equalled since the dawn of Christianity. Aside from the world-wide influence which they have exercised upon the cause of civil and religious liberty, and general progress in all the arts of peace, they suddenly elevated a young and dependent country to influence and power among the family of nations, and the American people to the dignities of self government and the blessings of abundance. From thirteen oppressed colonies, with less than three millions of inhabitants, we have now thirty-one sovereign States, all teeming with wealth and the elements of national greatness, inhabited by nearly thirty millions of intelligent and happy citizens, with a commerce extending to every port on the globe—a canvass in every sea, and our representatives duly considered at every Court, as well where hated as where loved. And this has been accomplished through the light of liberty and its benign institutions. It has been the work of our National Union, and the well considered compact by which it is held together. Perpetuate these relations, and, on the past basis, the close of the present century will find the United States with a population of one hundred millions, and all the moral and political elements of national greatness vigorous and pure. The strength of our republic, it is manifest, consists largely in the substantial interests which each individual has in the permanency of those wise institutions which confer equal portions of sovereignty and dignity on the richest and poorest, the highest and humblest; which were baptised in the blood of our revolutionary struggle and transmitted to us as a sacred legacy by our fathers. The Union is the citizen's guarantee for the future enjoyment of all these blessings, as it is for the continued progress and prosperity of the nation. [Applause.]

The perpetuity of these institutions, with their varied and ample blessings for the use of others, is our highest duty to the world. Our government is a peculiar one, differing, to a greater or less extent, from any to be found in ancient or modern times. It is a representative system, in which the will of the governed is felt, at short intervals, in every department. The mass of the people is recognised as the proper source of governmental power, and the ballot-box is the medium through which the popular will is reflected. This is called self government. Each citizen, high or low, rich or poor, has his part in the government—is endowed with high privileges and charged with grave responsibilities. It is not only his right to vote, but his duty to do so. [Applause.] Under this system all measures of government emanate from the popular will; by it one man is accepted and another rejected; one measure of policy sustained and another repudiated.

In the great work of giving effect to the vital principles of our republic, the Democratic party has ever been prominent and efficient. With occasional brief intervals it has held unbroken sway in the government, and the highest vindication of its policy is furnished in the unexampled prosperity of the country. In this is found a ready answer to all the allegations of the opposition. The tree should be judged by its fruits.

Besides, its policy and measures have been uniformly vindicated by time and experience, and those of the opposition condemned. Such was the case as to the acquisition of the territory of Louisiana and Florida; the war of 1812; the annexation of Texas; the war with Mexico; the acquisition of California, as also with regard to a mammoth bank, a sub-treasury, and the tariff; whilst the opposition were as uniformly wrong, as in the case of the alien and sedition laws, the bankrupt act, and the tariff of 1842. No other party has been so uniformly wrong. Had it been their purpose to be on the wrong side of all questions, foreign or domestic, they could not have succeeded so well. It is almost incredible that there is not a vestige of their policy to be found in the government. And still our success is as important as ever. Perhaps there never was a time when the triumph of the Democratic party was more essential than now, or a time when its beauties were so well reflected as in its present contest for the rights of the States against Abolitionism, and for civil and religious liberty against Know-nothingism.

PENNSYLVANIA, BUCHANAN AND BRECKINRIDGE.

We are rapidly approaching the Presidential election, involving the ascendancy of our party and its principles. When the day comes, every man should do his duty. Whatever others may do, as for me and my household, we shall vote for Buchanan and Breckinridge. [Great applause.] Buchanan is a distinguished son of our own great State. She has often honored him, and he in turn has added to her laurels. His election will be justice to both. [Applause.] For many years Pennsylvania has sought the distinction of presenting him to the nation as President—her jewel and their hope, for her pride and their benefit. [Applause.] She was warranted in this pretension. Her political and moral influence in the family of States justified her. She has been a true member of the confederacy. She has done what she agreed to do. She has been faithful to the compact—to every feature of it. She has been loyal in peace and liberal in war. She has done justice and promoted peace among her sisters. She was among the first to ratify the constitution, and she will be the last to violate it. She possesses the birth-spot of Independence, the Constitution, and the Union, and neither shall ever die with her consent. [Great applause.] The State-house bell that first signaled the news that Liberty was born—that the convention had done the deed—sounded in the midst of her metropolis. The funeral-tolls she has sworn never to hear. [Applause.] In the Revolution she did her part. In the war of 1812, her men and money were freely tendered. So also in

the war with Mexico. Central in geographical position, she has always been so in the confidence and affections of the family. [Applause.] Unequalled in the extent and variety of her industrial pursuits, as in her natural elements of greatness, wealth, and power; second only to one of her sisters in the number of her population, and to none in moral and political greatness; in her love of country and sense of justice. She has always been true to the constitution. In future she will go for those who go for the Union; she will despise those who trample upon the rights of any section. [Applause.] And yet she has never, up to this eightieth year of the nation's age, been honored with the Presidency, in the person of one of her own citizens. The southern States have had nine; those on the east of her three; and on the west four—she none. What Pennsylvanian can look upon this picture, and then raise his voice against the proffered honor?

But the inclination to honor the State was not the only consideration that operated upon the nominating convention. Mr. Buchanan presented attractions. I believe he would have been nominated irrespective of his local residence. The exigencies seemed to call for him. His long experience, his clear and calm judgment, and steady firmness, so often evinced in trying times, designated him. He had been schooled in the most difficult ordeals of the past; had drawn his lessons of wisdom from Madison and Jackson; enjoyed the companionship and example of Clay and Webster, Calhoun and King, Wright and Polk. Since 1814 he has, with brief intervals, served the public, and excelled in every position—in Congress, in the cabinet, and at foreign courts. When Jackson's name was presented to the people, Buchanan took the lead. [Applause.] When the attempt was made to cheat the old hero after he had the most votes, Mr. Buchanan resisted the scheme. When Jackson put his heel on the bank, Buchanan helped him to keep it there. [Applause.] When the old hero said the French must pay or fight, Buchanan stood by him. When, in 1841, the opposition passed the Bankrupt act, Mr. Buchanan resisted it and foretold its frightful consequences. When at the same session they attempted to abolish the sub-treasury and substitute a fiscal agency, Mr. Buchanan resisted them. When, about the same time, they taught heresies on the subject of the currency and the revenue laws, his powerful arguments, so strikingly sanctioned by experience, defeated their purposes. When it was proposed to re-annex Texas, Buchanan judged rightly and went for it. When our difficulties with Mexico presented themselves, Old Buck was for fight: he counselled wisely throughout that struggle. When it was proposed to restrict the occupancy of the Territories, so as to keep the people of one section of the country out, Mr. Buchanan opposed the movement. When, at the court of St. James, John Bull wanted to dictate his toilet, Old Buck went to the court with his own coat and breeches on. When Lord Palmerston wanted to cheat us under the Clayton and Bulwer treaty, Mr. Buchanan soaked his false logic, and then wiped it out. I tell you more that he did. When the compromise measures of 1850 were adopted, he took the stump and sustained them. I stood by him many a hot day, whilst he demonstrated the constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave law, and endeavored to convince the people that those measures should be a

finality on every point to which they referred; among the rest, that the people of the Territories should settle the slavery question to suit themselves. That was my doctrine in that terrible campaign, and I know that we agreed. When bogus Americanism first started, his sagacious mind at once detected and exposed its fallacies. I can tell you what he did besides. When he was defeated for the Presidential nomination in 1848, he supported his successful competitor, General Cass; when, in 1852, his claims were again deferred, he took the stump for General Pierce. You will all remember that when Thaddeus Stevens and Joseph Ritner re-chartered the bank, Mr. Buchanan said it was rotten; and when the same party attempted to reclaim with the cartridge-box what they had lost at the ballot box, and usurp the government, Mr. Buchanan met them on the threshold. He has done many good things, and when he is President he will do more.

His companion, Mr. Breckinridge, is all that we could desire. He is a distinguished and favorite son of Kentucky. Though quite young, he has made his mark both as a soldier and as a statesman. In the field and in Congress he was alike admired. His short career in the House of Representatives has served to distinguish him as a man of great powers of mind, and as a statesman of enlarged views, as a high-toned gentleman and fine scholar. He will preside over the Senate with dignity, and be the hope of the nation should the first office be vacated by death or otherwise.

J. C. FREMONT AND SECTIONALISM.

So much for the Democratic; now for the other side. And here I am at fault, for I am not certain that I can call to mind the frightful array of candidates and the *isms* they represent. First, then, is Colonel Fremont and Mr. Dayton, representing sectional or Black Republicanism; next stands Millard Fillmore, administrator *de bonis non* of the deceased Whig party, with Andrew Jackson Donelson for Vice President, representing national Know-nothingism; then comes Commodore Stockton and Kenneth Rayner, the embodiment of refractory Americanism; and last, but not least, stand Gerrett Smith and Mr. McFarlane, disciples of intensified abolitionism. Then there is Maine-lawism, spiritualism, woman's-rightism, and other isms to be equally apportioned. Differing as to many things, these parties and elements unite in one common bond of hostility to the Democracy. Dissimilar in faith and form, they readily fraternize on the platform of place and power. You mistake my purpose, however, very much, fellow-citizens, if you suppose that I intend to dissect this frightful array of candidates and their appurtenances. I shall look after Colonel Fremont briefly, and he only. As for Mr. Fillmore, it is evident that he has no available party in this section of the Union. Well, now, as to this Republican candidate; who can tell me why he was nominated? I have looked in vain for one good reason. Is he a statesman? What are, and what have been his views on great questions of domestic or foreign policy? What great measure did he ever propose? What views on political economy has he given to the world? When and where did he study the science of government? Where is his record?

Where can we find the evidence that he is fit to be a successor to George Washington? What has he done for the nation to give him claim to this world-wide distinction? What act of his life entitles him to so large a share of public confidence? What battles has he fought and victories won? "On what meat doth this our Cæsar feed, that he has grown so great?" Can his friends answer? They may have hidden reasons, but it is time they were developed. Perhaps they sought a hero without scars, and a statesman without a record. Perhaps they sought a clean sheet on which to make their own impressions. Perhaps the Republican party, just starting out on *geographical principles*, not certain what route to take, nor where to go, have concluded that they would need an *engineer*—that as they do not go by *principles*, they had better go by the *compass*. And having heard that Colonel Fremont had traced the sinuosities of the sides and scaled the heights of the Rocky mountains, and found a bumble-bee on Wind Gap range, he is just the man for the emergency. It is true that Colonel Fremont did cross these mountains under the patronage, protection, and pay of the government, but it is equally true that other men did the same thing on their own responsibility; and they do not ask to be President. Kit Carson was immense in this way, and yet he is not even out for Vice President. It is also true that Colonel Fremont performed certain brilliant feats in California about the time of its acquisition, for which he was court-martialed, and found guilty on every count. It also appears that he represented that State in the United States Senate for a brief period, and was relieved from further service, at the next election, by almost common consent. But these things furnish reason for making him President. But be the reasons what they may, I shall miss my guess if his friends be not in the position of the western traveller, in the choice of bad roads—wishing they had taken another, before they get to the end of the race; and I shall miss it still further if the Colonel does not find it more difficult to discover a pass to the White House than one over the Rocky mountains. I mean no unkindness to Colonel Fremont. He is doubtless a very good man in his way, and quite eminent in his science, but mathematics is not the only qualification for the Presidency. The science of government is a different and far more difficult study. It would be no more absurd to employ a blacksmith to make a gold watch, or a lawyer to expound the gospel, than to select an engineer to act as Chief Magistrate. But seriously, gentlemen, is there one man in this vast assembly who can look another in the face, and say that Colonel Fremont is the man who should have the direction of our national affairs at this critical juncture, in these times of foreign and domestic trouble? I do not believe any man will say this. The idea is absurd.

But I object to Mr. Fremont on other grounds. He has been presented and is supported as a sectional candidate. He was nominated by the northern and eastern States, and not one paper or public man, so far as my knowledge goes, has come out for him in the south. In form and in spirit, therefore, his nomination was sectional. I am no alarmist, for I have great confidence in the sober judgment of the people, but I cannot close my eyes to the dangerous tendencies of geographical parties. From their very nature they must beget discontent

and suggest separation. It is the first time that a candidate of respectable strength has been presented on sectional ideas. Should he be elected, he will be the President of a section and the benefactor of a faction. He cannot represent truly the whole nation. He will be under obligations to one section only. The slaveholding States can have no part or lot in his administration. His advisers will be from one section. The honors and emoluments of the government would be conferred upon that section, and the South be excluded. It has been the usage of parties to claim the patronage for their friends, and it will not be pretended that Colonel Fremont is the man to rise above the rule. But the whole idea is wrong; it is in conflict with the genius of our institutions, which is intended equality for all the States. It is at variance with the duties to be performed and the obligations to be assumed; the certain tendencies being to alienate the feelings of the people of one section from those of the other, and to embitter the channels of national intercourse—to weaken the ties which bind the States together. Nor will it do to point to the Fremont platform and say that it declares for the Union. The party triumphant upon sectional grounds, northern or southern, might prate about the Union, but disaffection would come from the defeated section, the people of which, feeling that they were no longer equal under the constitution, would claim their right to a release from all its obligation. Washington foresaw the danger, and his monitions should not be lightly heeded. Much as I admire Mr. Buchanan, I could not vote for him as a sectional candidate.

KANSAS—SENATE BILL.

But now for the Kansas question, and the course of the Republican or Fremont party. Ever since the commencement of the present session of Congress the whole country has been agitated, deeply and violently agitated, concerning the state of society in Kansas. The most accomplished artists of the Republican party have painted the startling picture from time to time. That the simple reflection of the truth would have made a picture dark enough, no one can doubt; but that these gentlemen, for purposes of their own, have given it the deepest shade practicable, is just as evident. We have been told by the Republican orators in Congress, on the rostrum and in the pulpit, that the people of Missouri had invaded the Territory, and controlled the elections for members of the legislature held in March, 1855; that the free-State men had been driven from the polls; that the government had been usurped by mere brute force; that the laws of Kansas were not valid laws; that the people would and should resist them; that anarchy reigned in Kansas; that arsons and murders were invoked to serve the ends of slavery; that finally Kansas and liberty lay bleeding at the feet of the border ruffians, and that the whole country was on the verge of civil war. Here is their picture. Now what remedy did the Republican representatives in Congress propose? Did they ask a legal and just measure of reform? By no means, fellow-citizens; but with denunciations against the lawless authorities of Kansas still fresh on their lips, they became the advocates of the Topeka convention and the State constitution framed by

that body—a movement admittedly without law, and in contravention of all law and in menace of the government. With all their seeming reverence for the law; they could advocate a revolutionary step taken in defiance of the government. Up to that time we had been told that the admission of Kansas as a State was the only remedy for her evils; the only mode of quieting the public mind, and averting civil war in the Territory.

Well, gentlemen, it had become apparent to all, that some effective and final measure of pacification was demanded by the best interests, not only of Kansas, but of the whole nation; that while the laws of the local legislature were technically legal, the right of suffrage had been abused in selecting the members, and that many of the statutes were oppressive and unjust, and in conflict with the constitution and the original Kansas-Nebraska act.

With a view to meet these difficulties, Mr. Toombs, a southern senator, about ten days since, introduced a bill providing for the prompt admission of Kansas as a State. His proposition was referred to the Territorial Committee, and reported to the Senate on Monday last, by Mr. Douglas, and Wednesday fixed for a final vote.

That bill provides that the present inhabitants may elect delegates to a convention to meet in November next, to form a constitution, preparatory to admission as a State; that a board of five commissioners should be appointed by the President, to repair to the Territory, to superintend the election of delegates; to make an enumeration of the legal voters, and put up a list of voters at every district; and that only those who are now in the Territory, and those who may have left on business, or because of the sad state of the society, shall vote. The law throws ample guards about the ballot-box, by heavy penalties against illegal voting or violent efforts to interfere with the right of suffrage; it also annuls all the Territorial statutes subversive of the liberty of speech and the freedom of the press, and those requiring an oath of fidelity to the fugitive slave law as a qualification for a voter, and other absurd provisions. These statutes being inconsistent with the constitution and the organic law, are clearly within the scope of the Congressional correction, without interfering with the doctrine of non-intervention, for the Kansas law provides that the action of the Territorial legislature shall be confined “to rightful subjects of legislation.” Here, then, was a measure of peace and law—the prompt admission of Kansas as a State, irrespective of her decision on the slavery question; its vital objects being to terminate at once all motive on the part of outsiders to force temporary population into the Territory, with the view to control its policy on the slavery question.

What followed? Did the Republican senators support this measure? Did they accept this proposition to bring Kansas in as a State? By no means. It met their violent resistance. The first demonstration came from the senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Wilson, who proposed to strike out the entire bill and insert a section, simply repealing all the laws of Kansas; substituting anarchy for the admission of the Territory as a State. The senator from New York, Mr. Seward, the leader and the intellect of that party, still insisted upon the Topeka constitution.

In the face of all his anathemas against the lawless authorities in Kansas, he voted to sanction a measure wanting in the slightest coloring of authority, and which had been brought forth in defiance of the law and its officers; and his course seems to be sanctioned by the entire Republican press, headed by that common fountain of fanaticisms, falsehoods, and vagaries, the *New York Tribune*.

The senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Hale) proposed to strike out the fourth of July, 1856, as the time that the law should take effect, and insert July, 1857, so that the strife in Kansas might last a year longer; that bleeding Kansas, for whose people so many crocodile tears have been shed, might bleed on. They first objected that the local laws forbade and punished free discussion, and thus the slavery men had the advantage; then the bill was amended, as had been agreed upon by the committee, so as to annul all such laws. The next objection was, that the free-State men had been driven from the Territory, and the friends of slavery would have things all their own way; then the bill was so amended as to give all former citizens the opportunity to return and participate in the election. The next plea was that the intention and effect was to bring Kansas in as a slave State. The answer was no; it provides that the unrestrained will of the *bona fide* citizens shall settle that question, and that the objection could not properly come from the Republican side, because they had uniformly claimed that a very large majority of the real settlers are against slavery, and that all they sought was a fair expression of popular will. But reason was powerless. They resisted to the end, and finally the bill passed at the end of a session of twenty-one hours, by a vote of 33 to 12.

Within a few hours after, the House passed a bill admitting Kansas under the Topeka constitution, and thus the issue is fairly made up. The Democrats are for bringing in Kansas by the straight way and under the auspices of the law; the Republicans insist upon her admission by the crooked way—a way tarnished by violence and revolution. The Democrats contend for a constitution to be made by the whole people, through a pure ballot-box; the Republicans, for one made by a party without the agency of law or of the ballot box. Judge ye between us.

But it is said that the Kansas troubles have proceeded from the legislation of 1854—that the doctrine of non-intervention has failed, and the democracy are responsible. This is the best our enemies can do; but it is bad logic. It is a sufficient answer to say, in reply, that we have had peace and quiet in Nebraska, as we have had also in Utah and New Mexico—all organized on the doctrine of non-intervention. The difficulties in Kansas were the inevitable consequences of the undue officiousness of outsiders—fanatical abolitionists on the one hand, and fire-eating southerners on the other. The press and the pulpit have pointed to Kansas as a kind of battle-field for the slavery and anti-slavery feeling of the whole country, and invited people to go there and fight it out. Men unsettled in their purposes, and without fixed principles, have been sent into the Territory, stimulated with prejudices and armed with deadly weapons, to determine a question of

local policy. What could we expect short of lawless violence? The agency the pulpit has had in this work meets my unqualified condemnation. I cannot see why the temples that were cleared of the money-changers, should be polluted with a question of bitter partisanship and one of populating the Territories. To expound the gospel is a work which should be equal to any man's ambition; and the dissemination of its truths is just the best way possible to constrain statesmen as well as the people to do what is right in the Territories as well as in the States.

But these conflicts are not fatal to the theory of the law—to the doctrine of self-government. It is a principle vindicated by our experience. It is suited to all territories and all ages; as broad as the universe and as imperishable as the mountains. Its application to the question of slavery in the Territories was intended as a finality. Whatever the powers of Congress may be, it was politic and wise to forego its use and trust the question with the people. For one I regard the policy as settled forever, and that hereafter the people of the Territories, through their local legislature, are to control the question of slavery in their own way; and why should they not be permitted to do this? Many of my former neighbors are now in the Territories, and it would seem unreasonable that I should claim the right to legislate for them. Certainly I am not so competent to judge as they. There is not only beauty in this theory, but there is practical justice in it. A man loses none of his natural or inherent rights by changing his residence from a State to a Territory. The sovereignty not delegated to the general government accompanies him, in full force and virtue. I can see but two sources of power to legislate for the Territories: Congress is one, and the people the other; and I hold that when Congress expressly confers upon the people all its powers, as in the case of the Kansas law, the law-making power of the people is complete—equal to any subject of local legislation; the practical workings being to the effect, that as the people when they become a State have perfect control over the subject of slavery, they should have it as a Territory. For the purposes of excitement, however, the impression has been strengthened, that the policy of the Territory on the question is to be permanently settled by an incipient step. Such is not a correct view. The question, like any other, will at all times be within the control of the people. Should Kansas come into the Union as a free State, the people could afterwards establish slavery, and *vice versa*.

SLAVERY—THE REMEDY.

On the general subject of slavery I have often given my views. I do not know why Providence in his wisdom permitted the African to find his way to this continent, nor why England was induced to fasten the institution of slavery upon the colonies. I cannot tell what God may intend to bring out of the relations now existing between the races in our country; but this I do know, that when the constitution was agreed upon between the States, each being sovereign and independent, slavery was recognised in the second section of the first article as to the ratio of representation in Congress, and in the second section of the fourth article, as to the rendition of fugitives from labor; that,

after the fullest deliberation, the convention, with Washington at its head, agreed to tolerate and protect the institution. I know, too, that when a compact is made between equal and independent parties, it is good morals and good faith to carry it out. And still the institution so established is a constant theme of agitation. The most fanatical abolitionists dare not deny that it is the right of a State to have it or not, and that no outside power can rightfully interfere; still a war of crimination and recrimination has been kept up. The motives of the southern people in retaining it, have been subjected to the most uncharitable criticisms; whilst, in turn, assaults of equal violence have been made upon northern men and their motives—all tending to an alienation of the people from each other, and to prepare them for violent separation. From my boyhood, and in my very heart, I have deprecated these mutual dissensions, because they can do no possible good to either white or colored race; their tendencies are to evil, and to evil only. They may hazard, as I fear they do hazard, the peace and best interests of twenty-five millions of white citizens, without the possibility of improving the condition of the three millions of the colored race. It is astonishing that even fanaticism—inveterate fanaticism—should sanction practices so unwise, and efforts so directly in contravention of the constitution, and so wasteful of the heritage which it vouched safe to all. The abolition presses teem with the most vile execrations of an evil which they cannot avert, and their orators enunciate sentiments full of treason. Wendell Phillips, for instance, declared in a convention at New York—“*The only remedy for the slave is the destruction of the government.*” “I challenge any man to tell me what the *Union* has done for us.” Lloyd Garrison, at the same convention, proposed to resolve, “That the one grand vital issue to be made with the slave power, is the *dissolution of the existing American Union.*” Henry C. Wright said—“I like the resolution very much.” “I don’t care the snap of my finger for the constitution, when the question of slavery is to be concerned. The only thing of importance is, that the mass of the people venerate the constitution. We should endeavor to do away with this. *I thank God that I am a traitor to that constitution.*” Edmund Quincy, on the same occasion, said that “the constitution displayed the ingenuity of the very devil, and that the Union ought to be dissolved.” Mr. Wade, now a Republican senator from Ohio, in a speech to the people of Maine, in August, 1855, denounced the slaveholders as a “handful of aristocrats,” and the system as one of outrage, aggression, and wrong; that its very life, its being, is an outrage, and that “the *infamous fugitives law should be repealed.*” Mr. Seward, in a speech made at Buffalo, in October last, speaking of society in the slave States, says that “the non-slaveholder in the slave States is allowed no independence, no neutrality; whilst pistols and knives enforce not merely their silence, but their actual partnership for slavery.”

Mr. Seward, in the Senate, on last Wednesday, declared, with great earnestness of manner, that “the day for compromises had gone by.” Mr. Sumner, of Massachusetts, in November last, at Boston, said, “it is an oligarchy odious beyond precedent; heartless, grasping, tyrannical;

careless of humanity, right or the constitution; *stuck together only by a confederacy of spoliations.*" The Boston *Liberator*, of the 20th ultimo, says: "The United States constitution is a covenant with the devil, and an agreement with hell;" and again, that "the only issue is the dissolution of the Union." The New York *Standard* is but little less violent, and the *Tribune* is vigilant in its work of fanning the flames. No man can notice these things without feeling that we have fallen upon evil times.

But let us turn from these disgusting incendiarisms, and read our duty on the subject of federal relations, as presented by Washington, in his last address. He says: "It is of infinite moment that you should properly estimate the value of your National Union, to your individual and collective happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it—accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as a palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with zealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can in any event be abandoned, and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of any attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties that now link together the various parts."

And yet, these fanatics have no remedy. Samson-like, they are bent on tearing down the temple, though they perish beneath the ruins. They have never offered either a practical or legal remedy for the evils of which they complain. So far, their efforts have harmed the slave; restricted his opportunities and tightened his chains. If they think the African would be happier in his own country, why do they not aid the Colonization Society? When the South, with Clay in the lead, attempted this scheme, the abolitionists turned their backs on it.

But suppose no constitutional obstacles to intervene, or that the southern people should agree to emancipate their slaves, at a stated period, provided they were taken away and properly maintained—what then could be done? Could a scheme be devised to better their condition? Who would employ, feed, and clothe these helpless beings?—Where could a home be found for them? Would they be permitted to come north? I think not. But, suppose they were; would the change improve their condition? Would they live easier or happier? Would they be elevated in the scale of moral being, and would their ideas of civilization and Christianity be more expanded? Let any man who seeks an answer to these questions, study the condition of the free blacks of the North. Freedom to them, without political and social equality with the whites, for which they are unfit, is mockery: "The word of promise to the ear, to be broken to the hope." It may be, fellow-citizens, that there are those among us who would be willing to assign equality to the colored race. If there be any such, I would advise them to compare the sin of degrading our race, with that of slavery in its present form, and then, if perfectly satisfied with the policy, to commence the practice themselves. I do not pretend to find a remedy for the sad condition of the colored race, though I feel as much sympathy for them as most men. I only insist that those who are supplying the fountains of bitter agitation, and

poisoning the channels of intercourse between sister States, should tell us what to do, or cease their unwise clamors. Now, do not misunderstand me: I am no advocate of African slavery—I simply look at the question as I find it, under the constitution, and at the alternatives presented.

Then, again, I should be glad if those who are constantly attempting to tarnish the fame of our country by overdrawn pictures of what they term the national sin of African servitude, would point us to the spot on the face of the earth, or name the period of its history, in which the condition of the African is, or was, better than at present in the United States. When and where did he enjoy greater physical comforts or a higher degree of mental culture? When more of a freeman? When and where has he stood higher in the scale of civilization? Mr. Evans, of the Senate, who has examined the subject thoroughly, says that there is no spot where an equal number live so well as the slaves of the South. In what instance has a large community given evidence of capacity for government? They were not freemen bereft of liberty when brought to our shores; but slaves of the lowest grade—slaves to their own countrymen. History tells us that Africa has been “a country of slaves and masters.” Park and Denham, and other travellers, describe society as in the lowest stage of barbarism. If it were possible, then, to return these people to the country and condition of their ancestors, the act would be an outrage upon humanity and civilization.

And yet there are those who would hazard our happy Union in this vain effort—who would bring ruin upon the white, because they cannot elevate the colored race. They are mad men.

KNOW-NOTHINGISM.

Now, fellow-Democrats, with your consent, I shall pay my respects to the Know-nothing wing of the opposition. This is a party of bad principles, and even worse forms and practices. It came into existence for the avowed purpose of invading individual rights, and subverting the covenants of the constitution and laws. I shall never forget the sensation produced by the enunciation of the doctrine, on the very spot where liberty was declared, that birth-place and religious belief should be tests of civil office; that “Americans must rule America;” that the intellect of man, so incomprehensible to himself, his moral virtue, his very soul, was to be measured by the accident of birth and religious faith. No matter how great, and brilliant, and pure, and god-like his attributes, if born in the wrong place, or if he bowed the knee at the wrong shrine, he was doomed to obscurity.

But this new Order was readily recognised as an old enemy in a fresh garb, concocted by the same spirits who, a short time previously, had scouted the principles on which it was based. The *Know-nothings* who, in 1852, denounced General Pierce as a *bigoted Protestant*, and attempted to sustain the charge by *Catholic certificates*; the same sensitive *Know-nothings* who circulated the famous pictorial biography of General SCOTT, their candidate, displaying him in the midst of groups of *raw Irishmen*, listening to their complaints, and ministering to their wants; and all this to prove that he was a generous man, who would not

neglect the poor down-trodden foreigner. It was the candidate of these Know-nothing leaders who travelled the country in the last presidential contest to win the votes of foreign-born citizens by ridiculous twaddle about the "rich Irish brogue," and the "sweet German accent." It was their candidate who proposed to interpolate a new plank in the platform, to the effect that any *species of humanity mustering in the army* for one year *should have the right of suffrage*.

Notwithstanding Gen. Scott's identity with the Catholic church, these Know-nothings voted for him, and they would have done so had the Pope been his daily companion. But Scott was not elected. These much courted people voted as theretofore—some for the Democratic, and some for the Whig candidate, thus vindicating themselves against the charge of clanishness now so freely made. But a change came over the views of their *former admirers* the *Know-nothings*. The foreign accent lost its charms, and the groups of Irish with whom Scott had mingled, as well as the church with which he was identified, have been converted into hideous monsters to alarm the weak and ignorant; and hence Know-nothingism.

It is almost incredible that any portion of the American people should have embraced a doctrine so offensive and unjust, and, above all, that they should have so readily indulged in all the evils and wrongs of which they complained. Thus, claiming to be *peculiarly American*, they embraced principles distinctly *anti-American*. Professing reverence for *republican institutions*, they made war on their very essence—*civil and religious freedom*. Deprecating secret and clanish movements in others, they adopted the practice themselves. Discarding, in terms of bitterness, *Jesuitism in matters of religion*, they determined to try it in *politics*. Professing profound reverence for the teachings of Washington, they adopted a *plan of organization against which that good man had warned the people*.

All this because they had suddenly become alarmed about the dangers of foreign influence, and the power of the Catholic church and the Pope. But sensible people, looking at the census, discovered that there are only about 800 *Catholic priests* in the United States, against 25,000 *energetic and untiring Protestant preachers*—thirty of the latter to one of the former—and also, that the foreign-born citizens are about as *one to twenty-three native-born*. They could discover no cause of alarm in such a picture. They were reminded, too, that our fathers were not afraid of foreigners or Catholics, in times past; that they had counselled together when Independence was declared, and when the constitution was made; that the foreign and native born, the Protestant and Catholic, had stood and fell together in the war of the Revolution—in that of 1812, and again in that with Mexico; that they had paid taxes in times of peace; that La Fayette, Montgomery, De Kalb, Kosciusko, were foreigners. They even remembered that Tom Corwin, who said that American soldiers in Mexico should be welcomed with bloody hands to hospitable graves, is a native, and that General Shields, who was shot at Cerro Gordo whilst commanding a charge on the enemy, is an Irishman. They were reminded, also, that we fixed the conditions on which the people of other countries, of every religious

denomination could become citizens equal with ourselves; that we had invited them to come; that we had boasted of our vast unoccupied territory, of freedom of speech, liberty of press, and dignity of self-government—of an asylum for the oppressed; the land of the free and the brave, where men could worship their God according to the dictates of conscience, and there should be none to molest or make them afraid. That so invited, many have come from every country, and of every religious belief; and that having complied with our terms, we were bound forever; that all attempts to take from them any of the privileges or opportunities thus bestowed, is bad faith and bad morals.

These considerations checked the progress of Know-nothingism. Two years ago it sallied forth, with the imperious bearing of a Goliath, challenging the Democracy to single combat; but now it is more like a shorn Samson, hiding its face for very shame. It is a proud remembrance that the Democracy of Pennsylvania had met this new order at the very threshold of its career, and resisted it, regardless of consequences, preferring the right to victory. I have often said before, that the contest of 1854 would compose one of the brightest pages in the history of the Democratic party.

KNOW-NOTHINGISM AND BLACK REPUBLICANISM UNITED.

But I wish you to look at the joint or combined enemy for a moment. No one has failed to notice the efforts which are being made to bring about a fusion between the Republicans and Know-nothings in the North. The first coincidence is, that the New York Know-nothing convention, and the Philadelphia Black Republican convention, both nominated Mr. Fremont for President. Then, again, they have united at different points, on State and local officers. In Pennsylvania, for instance, they have but one ticket. And here they have acted together before, and may do so again. They did so in 1854 and in 1855, and have determined to do so at the coming October election. This work is the easier for the reason that, with a few exceptions, the Know-nothings are Black Republicans. Dissimilar as are their tenets of faith, they will unite, if it be necessary, to secure office and spoils. The examples we have in this State should satisfy us on that point. Now let us bring them in juxtaposition, and study the whole picture. *The Abolitionists, alias Republicans, are agitated to distraction about the hardships of the African slave; they are devoted to his interests,—are determined to sever his chains, and to elevate him in the scale of moral and political being. This is their faith and purpose.*

The Know-nothings, on the other hand, are pledged to proscribe all foreign-born and Catholic citizens from civil office, and thus *degrade a large class of white citizens*. They are not for the *African*, but they are against the *Irishman* and the *German*, the *Frenchman* and the *Welshman*, &c. It is perceived, then, that the success of Republicanism is the *triumph of the colored race*, whilst the triumph of Know-nothingism is the signal for the *prostration of a large class of white citizens*. Now I can hardly see how this business can be managed on joint account. Its practical workings presents sad difficulties. The negroes and the foreigners can never stand on the same platform. Fremont, if elected,

will be half Republican and half Know-nothing, for we are bound to believe that he will be the embodiment of the views of all his friends. Then how would he meet his obligations? Would he put the *negroes up* and the *foreigners down*, or *vice versa*? Either horn of the dilemma would be distressing. The most reasonable solution is, that as the Republicans and Know-nothings had triumphed on joint account, he would divide his favors. He would redeem his obligations to the Republicans by going in for the *colored race*; and in like manner he would redeem his faith to the Know-nothings, by *proscribing all foreign-born and Catholic citizens from office*. I can see no other reasonable version. But there are other phases of this fusion which I find it difficult to solve. For instance, I cannot understand how those abolitionists, whose sympathies have been so excited for the African, and for his promotion on grounds of humanity and liberality, can so readily fraternize with a party whose avowed purpose is to proscribe white citizens, and degrade them to a condition but little above that of the blacks. I had supposed that when the influence of benevolence got possession of the human heart, it would be *broad enough to cover the white as well as the black race*. And then, again, how can the Republicans, with any show of sincerity, denounce the repeal of the Missouri line, because of their reverence for compacts and good faith, and then make common cause with a midnight dynasty, whose avowed purpose is to break compacts, to disregard the constitution and laws, and violate the faith of our fathers, for the purpose of subverting rights and privileges conferred upon the foreign-born and Catholic citizens. These are things which I do not understand, nor do I believe that when Solomon said, "there is nothing new under the sun," he had any reference to a fusion like this.

But what is almost as incredible is, that in the face of this startling picture, some of the Republican presses have the boldness to claim the German vote for Mr. Fremont; and if it be true that "coming events cast their shadows before," we may look out for another edition of the farce of 1852, with the foreign-born citizens on the stage. But the attempt cannot rise above a farce. Surely our naturalized citizens are not to be deceived again, as they most surely will be, if they rely upon any protection but that furnished by the constitution and the laws and a Democratic administration.

In conclusion, gentlemen, let me exhort you to vigilance. We must elect our candidates for the sake of the party, its principles, and the country. Let no man interpose his personal concerns at a crisis so critical. We must have a union of all national men, regardless of former identity, for the sake of the union of the States. I am no alarmist; but I should dread the success of a geographical party and of secret societies at this time—the triumph of avowed aggression upon the States, and upon a portion of the people. I dread these things, because George Washington feared them, and because I can see in them the elements of national destruction. There seems no other obstacle to a glorious future but this sectional issue. The mists of bigotry are passing away. Some have talked of war. I have no fear of it. It will not come; but were it to come, it would not endanger our national existence. We can feed and fight our enemies at the same time. We have to fear home dissensions, and they only. The palladium of our liberties is the constitution, and we should stand by it through good or evil report; stick to it like the wrecked mariner to the last plank, while night and the tempest last. It is our hope and our guide. The boast of the Romans, that whilst the Colliseum stands, Rome will stand, was vain; but the faith of the American people, that whilst the constitution be obeyed the Union is safe, is a far more rational belief.

[NOTE.—Part of the Address omitted, in order to bring it within a limited space.]